

WARTIME PROHIBITION HELD CONSTITUTIONAL

Decision Handed Down by the United States Supreme Court Kills Hopes for "Wet" Holidays.

Washington, Dec. 15.—Wartime prohibition was held constitutional today by the Supreme Court in a unanimous decision. Thus vanished the hopes of many for a "wet" holiday time.

No decision was rendered on the cases involving the constitutionality of the Volstead law, the prohibition enforcement act, framed to carry out the intent of the prohibition amendment to the Constitution.

In passing, however, Associate Justice Brandeis did hold that the prohibition amendment was binding on the states as well as the federal government.

Still in Effect

The court entirely reversed the contention of the "wets" that wartime prohibition was outside the wartime powers of Congress and pointed out that wartime control of food and railroads still was in effect.

The decision added one of the final milestones to the long fight to make the country dry.

The court will render opinions again next Monday, at which time the beer cases are expected to be decided, after which the court will recess until January 5. The prohibition constitutional amendment will become effective January 16.

Upon the court's decision on the prohibition enforcement law will depend whether the federal government has at hand any legal means for making the amendment effective.

Prohibition, however, the dregs are confirmed. The constitutionality of wartime prohibition, will keep the country dry until the amendment is carried into effect by law of its own.

Reading Decision

The signing of the armistice did not abrogate the war powers of Congress, Associate Justice Brandeis said in reading the decision of the court.

Could Export Liquor

Justice Brandeis said the government did not appropriate the liquor by stopping its domestic sale, as the way was left open for exporting it.

War Powers

Justice Brandeis also called attention to the continued control of the railroads and the reassignment of powers by the government relative to coal and sugar under war acts to show that the government continues to exercise various war powers despite the signing of the armistice.

The constitutional prohibition amendment is binding on the federal government as well as the states and supercedes state laws, the court declared.

Unanimous

The judgment of the court in the Kentucky and New York cases was unanimous.

No Basis for Contention

Justice Brandeis said there was no basis for the contention that President Wilson's statement in his message vetoing the prohibition enforcement act that the war had come to an end, was a proclamation announcing the termination of the war.

No Action on Beer Cases

In rendering its opinion the court confined itself entirely to the wartime prohibition act and took no action on the so-called beer cases which attacked the constitutionality of the prohibition enforcement act.

THIRD TRIAL BRINGS VERDICT

\$7,000 Awarded Mrs. LeBoeuf For Death of Husband

Windsor, Dec. 14.—At 10:30 o'clock yesterday morning, after a deliberation of nearly 22 hours, the jury in the \$40,000 negligence case of Florence LeBoeuf, administratrix, of Worcester, Mass., against the town of Clarendon, returned to the court room with a verdict for the plaintiff, awarding her \$7,000 damages. Of this sum, \$2,000 was for the destruction of the LeBoeuf automobile and \$5,000 for the death of Mrs. LeBoeuf's husband, Leonard LeBoeuf.

The jury which finally rendered a verdict in this case was the third jury to hear the evidence, the two former panels having reached a disagreement. The case was first tried in U. S. District Court in October in Rutland and later in the December term of the same court held at Windsor. After the failure of the second jury to reach a verdict, Judge Harland B. Howe ordered the trial to be repeated at once.

The case was an outcome of an automobile wreck last summer in the town of Clarendon. The late Leonard LeBoeuf was instantly killed at Cold River bridge when the automobile driven by him struck the edge of the

bridge and dropped down to the river bed. The plaintiff claimed that the cause of the accident was the failure on the part of the town of Clarendon to provide a guard rail and warning signs in the vicinity of the bridge.

At the time of the accident, both Charles and Carleton LeBoeuf, relatives of the deceased, were seriously injured and both of these men have suits for damages pending. Attorneys Jones and Jones of Rutland, counsel for the plaintiff in the case which was decided yesterday, have asked Judge Harland B. Howe for the immediate trial of these two cases and it is possible that they will come up at the coming term of court in Brattleboro.

COUNTY IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION ANNUAL

Members Urged to be Present at Meetings to be Held in Bennington Thursday Afternoon.

President Guy B. Johnson and Acting Secretary William H. Wills are sending out circular letters urging the members of the Bennington County Improvement Association to be present at the annual meeting which will be held at the association headquarters in the Hawks' block, Bennington, Thursday afternoon, December 18th, at 2 o'clock.

In view of the unsettled conditions that have prevailed throughout the country during the past year the association has endeavored to continue its welfare work in the county at a minimum expense.

The maintaining of the office is believed to have been of material assistance to the Bennington County Farm Bureau and to the county chapter of the American Red Cross and the association is convinced that it has been a valuable factor although it has not insisted upon any special recognition.

Members, who attend the meeting, are requested to offer any suggestions deemed wise in furthering the work of the association. Membership blanks have been inclosed with the circular letters and it is hoped that they will be filled out and returned.

Directors are to be elected at the coming meeting. The board at present consists of A. B. Clark, F. C. Archibald, A. J. Holden, P. T. H. Pierson and P. H. Thompson.

RETIREMENT BOARD SETS RATE OF ASSESSMENT

Barre, Dec. 13.—M. B. Hillegas this morning issued the following statement relative to the teacher retirement fund and the management of it:

At the recent meeting of the teachers' retirement board the rate of assessment to be contributed by the teachers was fixed at 5 per cent of the annual salary.

The board, in accordance with the law, fixed the rate of interest to be allowed for the present year at 4 per cent compounded semi-annually.

It was decided to make collections in five equal installments, the first to be due as of Dec. 1 and the following to be assessed on Feb. 1, April 1, May 1 and June 1, in each case 30 days will be allowed for the payment of the assessments. All assessments that are paid on or before the first day of the month will draw interest from the beginning of the month. The deposits made after these dates will draw interest from the beginning of the following month.

The board approved the applications of nearly 300 teachers.

Proper forms are being prepared for the collection of the assessments.

REPAIR WORK ON THE FARM

A Knowledge of How to do Certain Repair Work at Home a Great Value to the Farmer.

During the short course in agriculture offered by the State University from December 30th to February 14th, a special course in farm repairs, wood-working, forging, etc. will offer an opportunity for instruction in iron and steel shaping, upsetting, drawing, and welding. This course should help a student to grasp the underlying principles in such a way as to enable him to understand and apply the methods to be employed in general forge work. The knowledge and experience so gained are invaluable especially to those on farms who have or may have a forge outfit of their own, thereby saving both time and money.

All the more important branches of agriculture are given consideration during the seven weeks course. Tuition is free. Address the Vermont State College of Agriculture, Burlington, Vermont.

FOURTEENTH DECENNIAL CENSUS OF THE U. S.

By the President of the United States of America, A Proclamation

Whereas, by the Act of Congress approved March 3, 1919, the Fourteenth Decennial Census of the United States is to be taken beginning on the second day of January, 1920; and

Whereas, a correct enumeration of the population every ten years is required by the Constitution of the United States for the purpose of determining the representation of the several States in the House of Representatives; and

Whereas, it is of the utmost importance to the interests of all the people of the United States that this Census should be a complete and accurate report of the population and resources of the Nation;

Now, therefore, I, Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States of America, do hereby declare and make known that, under the law aforesaid, it is the duty of every person to answer all questions on the census schedules applying to him and the family to which he belongs, and to the farm occupied by him or his family, and that any person refusing to do so is subject to penalty.

The sole purpose of the Census is to secure general statistical information regarding the population and resources of the country and replies are required from individuals only to permit the compilation of such general statistics. No person can be harmed in any way by furnishing the information required. The Census has nothing to do with taxation, with military or jury service, with the compulsion of school attendance, with the regulation of immigration or with the enforcement of any national, state or local law or ordinance. There need be no fear that any disclosure will be made regarding any individual person or his affairs. For the due protection of the rights and interests of the persons furnishing information every employee of the Census Bureau is prohibited, under heavy penalty, from disclosing any information which may thus come to his knowledge.

I therefore earnestly urge upon all persons to answer promptly, completely and accurately all inquiries addressed to them by the enumerators or other employees of the Census Bureau and thereby to contribute their share toward making this great and necessary public undertaking a success.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

Done in the District of Columbia this tenth day of November, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and nineteen, and of the independence of the United States the one hundred and forty-fourth.

(SEAL)

WOODROW WILSON.

By the President: William Phillips, Acting Secretary of State.

IMPORTANT FACTS ABOUT THE CENSUS

One of the Greatest National Efforts of Each Decade. Enumeration Begins January 2, 1920.

The census is required every ten years by the Constitution of the United States and by Act of Congress. The date named for beginning the 1920 census is January 2, but the "Census Day" is January 1.

In cities the population enumeration will be completed in two weeks.

The enumeration of farms will be completed within thirty days.

The censuses of manufactures, mines and quarries, oil and gas wells, and forestry and forest products will, as a rule, be taken by special agents and by correspondence, and not by enumerators.

The census is the means by which the Government ascertains the increase in the population, the statistics concerning agriculture, and the vital information concerning the resources of the Nation.

Census for Statistical Purposes Only. The census inquiries are defined by act of Congress.

The information gathered is strictly confidential, made so by law.

Census information can not under any circumstances be used as a basis for taxation, nor can it be used to harm any person or his property.

It has nothing whatever to do with detection, arrest, prosecution, or punishment of any person for any violation of any law.

Important questions Asked of all Persons

1. Age at last birthday.
2. Each person ten years of age and over will be asked whether he is

able to read or write.

3. Each person will be asked his birthplace as well as the birthplace of father and mother.

4. If foreign born the date of coming to the United States will be asked, and, if naturalized, the date of becoming a citizen; also mother tongue or native language.

5. Each head of a family will be asked whether his home is owned by him or rented. If owned, whether the home is mortgaged or free of debt.

6. Each person will be asked his occupation and whether he is an employer or employee or is working on his own account.

The answers to the above questions give valuable and vital information to the Government concerning the health, welfare, and progress of the persons under its protection.

Important Questions Asked of Farmers

1. Each occupant of a farm will be asked how many years, if any, he worked on a farm for wages; how many years, if any, he was a tenant; and how many years, if any, he farmed as an owner.

2. Whether he (a) owns, or (b) rents, or (c) partly owns and partly rents his farm, or whether (d) he operates the farm for others as a manager or superintendent.

3. How many acres in his farm? Number of improved acres? Number of unimproved acres and number of acres of woodland?

4. Total value of farm? Total value of buildings? Value of implements and machinery on farm?

5. Whether farm is mortgaged? If so, the amount of mortgage?

6. Expenses for feed, fertilizer, and labor in the year 1919?

7. Several questions concerning artificial drainage of his farm.

8. Number of cows, horses, sheep, chickens, and other domestic animals on the farm January 1, 1920?

9. Quantity of acreage of all crops grown on the farm in 1919, including fruits and vegetables?

10. Quantity of milk and butter sold off the farm during the year 1919?

11. Acreage of timber land on farm and value of forest products.

Correct answers to the above questions are of the utmost importance. The United States Department of Agriculture assisted the Census Bureau in preparing the questions on the agriculture schedule and appeals to farmers everywhere to keep farm records for census purposes.

Copies of the Agriculture schedule can be had in advance by any farmer by writing to the Director of the Census, Washington, D. C.

Farm Defined

A farm for the purposes of the census includes all the land cultivated by a single farmer either by his own labor or with the help of hired labor. It may be in two or more separate tracts, but it is all one farm if it is all under one management.

The land cultivated by a share hand or cropper, or by a cash renter, constitutes a separate farm and is not to be counted as the owner's farm or included in it, but should be reported in the name of the tenant.

Identification Cards Carried by Enumerators

Census enumerators will carry identification cards as well as written commissions. These will be shown promptly by the enumerators upon request of any person.

In all cases where persons are suspicious of impostors these identification cards should be demanded. It is against the Federal law to impersonate a Census official, and impostors should be reported to the authorities.

Census Questions Must be Answered. The Act of Congress providing for the Census makes it the duty of all persons to furnish the information asked for by the enumerators to fill out the census schedules. No persons should hesitate, neglect, or refuse to answer fully and accurately all the enumerator's questions. He only asks the questions necessary to fill the schedules as required by the Act of Congress.

Keepers of hotels, apartment houses, boarding or lodging houses, or tenements, must assist the enumerator in getting the information concerning the persons living in such hotels and houses.

Contract Marriages.

Contract marriage is now the commonly accepted doctrine that marriage is a civil contract requiring only the free and intelligent consent of parties capable of contracting. A contract of this sort, drawn up and signed, is a marriage in the eyes of the law in all the states.

GAME PRESERVE PLANNED IN SEARSBURG-SOMERSET

Commercial Scheme to Provide Hunting and Fishing for Visiting Sportsmen.

Brattleboro, Dec. 11.—Within a short time there will be placed in the hands of the owners of a tract of approximately 30,000 acres of cut-over timberland in the Deerfield River Valley a report made by Fred Cressy of Brattleboro, and Edwin S. Meigs of Montpelier of their explorations of the land, made for the purpose of determining its possibilities for a fish and game preserve on a large scale. The report is now in the hands of the law firm of Hervey, Maurice, Whitney & Fitts of this place, who had the survey made for the Deerfield Pulp Co. and the New England Power Co., which companies have large real estate holdings in Wilmington, Somerset and other towns.

Much of the tract in question has been cut over in the past several years, but there is growing timber upon it and by making it a vast fish and game preserve it would be serving a useful purpose during the period required for reforestation and while the timber is growing to marketable size.

In order to ascertain the exact conditions of the tract with respect to fish, game, ponds, streams, bogs, possibilities for pond sites for the propagation and culture of fish, as well as the possibilities of the country for maintaining wild life, Mr. Cressy and Mr. Meigs began about a month ago the task of visiting and inspecting the various lots, keeping a careful record of their work, and this record has just been filed, with their report, with the law firm above mentioned.

The explorers found a large number of signs of game, including bears, deer, wildcats, etc., besides a quantity of fish, but the brooks need to be restocked.

Whether anything will come of the project, which in extent is beyond anything in the line of a fish and game preserve now existing in the eastern part of the United States, cannot be stated until the owners of the property have examined the report and had time to consider the matter in its various phases in the light of the information that the report contains.

If the plan which the owners have in mind seems feasible and desirable it is expected that the preserve will be enclosed in a substantial way and doubtless a fish and game club organized, and in this connection the proximity of the tract to Boston and New York makes its possibilities seem almost limitless.

THE TREATY OF NEUILLY

By Frank H. Simonds

The world public has become so accustomed to treaties of peace which do not bring peace that the document just signed in the little town hall of Neuilly, a suburb of Paris familiar to the A. E. F. because of its great American hospital, has excited little comment. Yet, all things considered, this treaty may fairly be reckoned the worst of the series which began with the Treaty of Versailles.

The vice underlying this particular arrangement is the familiar evil discoverable in its predecessors. By comparison with the number of things it settles, it unsettles or postpones settlement of a far more considerable bulk. The object of the treaty was, in restoring peace with Bulgaria, to regulate the Balkan conditions; to erect a solid structure in place of the several jerry-built constructions which have followed one another since the Balkan States attacked Turkey just six years ago.

Vital Decisions Postponed

In point of fact, the treaty has settled nothing but the size of the wholly mythical "compensations" Bulgaria is expected to pay her neighbors and to trace the new Serbo-Bulgarian frontiers. By contrast, it has postponed three vital decisions: first, as to the Greek rights in Thrace; second, as to the European frontiers in Constantinople and the status of that city; third, as to the ultimate disposition of the southern Dobrudja.

To take these items in order: The Greeks have a claim, based upon historical grounds going back several thousands of years and upon racial grounds valid at this very minute, to all of the old Turkey in Europe south of that Bulgarian frontier which existed at the moment of the outbreak of the World War. This would include all of the Aegean seaboard left to Bulgaria by the Treaty of Bucharest in 1913 and everything in Eastern Thrace, including Adrianople, right up to the walls of Constantinople. In point of fact, their claim to Constanti-

nople is almost equally impressive.

But for the United States representatives in Paris this Greek claim would have been recognized, but our commissioners disclosed an astonishing solicitude for the Bulgars. Thus, we Americans have insisted that the Bulgarians have a corridor to the Aegean and have prevented the cessation of all of Thrace to the Greeks. We have done this in the face of Anglo-French wishes; we have alienated Greek friendship, we have postponed actual settlement, since Thrace is now ceded by Bulgaria to the great powers, who have postponed final allocation. In doing this we have not in the least placated the Bulgars, who will lose much territory, but we have kept alive their hope to regain things to which they have no claim.

Fume Over Again

This is the old story of Fiume over again. No compromise has been possible because of our stand, and at the same time the passions of both sides have been greatly intensified and the dangers of new hostilities multiplied.

The postponement of the disposition of Constantinople is due to the desire and expectation of Europe that the United States would take a mandate for the city and the wish of the European nations to consult our pleasure as to the size of the district about the town which we would regard as desirable to make our control easy. Both President Wilson and Colonel House advocated such an American mandate while in Paris, and it was the general expectation that an American acceptance of it would follow the prompt ratification of the treaty—which has not been ratified.

Thus, the Turk has been saved once more, at least temporarily, this time by America and not by Britain, and there is a growing belief that his retirement from Europe will not take place as a result of the latest war. Meantime, the whole Thracian question, together with that of Constantinople, remains unsettled, largely because of American conditions in Washington and American policies in Paris.

The third question, adjourned without date, is that of southern Dobrudja. Rumania annexed it in 1913. No one will argue that the Rumanian claim is based upon the will of the inhabitants. But it was based upon the expectation of a Bulgarian attack and the necessity to protect the Bucharest-Constantza railway. The attack actually came in 1916, was successful, and, following it, Bulgaria acquired the whole of the Dobrudja, north as well as south, with all the seacoast of Rumania, by the notorious Treaty of Bucharest in 1918.

At Paris the American delegation advocated a policy which would have compelled Rumania to resign the southern Dobrudja. Conceivably, Rumania would have made concessions, had her claims elsewhere—just claims in the main—been recognized. She purposed to cede most of it to Bulgaria provided certain Bulgarian territory went to Serbia and Serbia was constrained to evacuate her corner of the Banat. But this compromise was rejected.

The result is a quarrel between Serbia and Rumania over the Banat and the postponement of any decision as to the Dobrudja, which keeps alive the Bulgarian-Rumanian quarrel. To this is also added the perpetuation of the Greco-Bulgarian dispute of Thrace. Today Rumanian and Serb troops face each other in arms in the Banat. Bulgarian and Greek forces confront each other in Thrace, and the rivalries between Bulgaria and Rumania have abated little since the Paris Conference first undertook to force Rumania to cede the southern Dobrudja and then abandoned the task.

Wars to Come

Americans are little interested in the acts of the Balkans. The nationwide weariness over European wrangles is growing rather than lessening, but it is necessary to recall that the failure of the great powers of Europe to settle the Balkan situation in 1913 led to the World War in 1914 and resulted in the sending of 2,000,000 American troops to France in 1917 and 1918. Therefore, we can hardly afford to be wholly unconcerned with a new treaty which preserves all the old causes for war in the Balkans and adds a few, for good measure, notably by bringing Serbia and Rumania into collision in the Banat, where, if Serbia's claims are good, her necessities elsewhere should advise the necessity of sacrifice. Cavour made in the case of Savoy and Nice two generations ago, thus winning for Italy that French aid which made Italian unity possible.—(Copyright, 1919, by The McClure Newspaper Syndicate.)